The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

VOL. XIV. APRIL 29, 1948 NISAN 20, 5708 No. 6

- ***INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION AND JEWISH CONTENT***
  by Werner J. Cahnman
- ***THE IMPACT OF THE JEWISH STATE ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN AMERICA***
  by Theresa Kohn
- ***GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY— "TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS" (Review)***
  by Nathan A. Barack
- ***RETROSPECT IN WRATH***
  by Marc H. Tanenbaum
- ***IT HAPPENS EVERY DAY IN JEWISH MIDDLETOWN***
  by Ben Zevi David

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $3.00 per year; 15¢ per copy; foreign 25¢ extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Immanuel Lewy, Edward T. Sandrow, Leo Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfied, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp. Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

WERNER J. CAHNMAN has a Ph.D. degree from the University of Munich. Since coming to the United States in 1940 he has lectured in various American colleges on economics and sociology. He is at present Resident Associate Viking Fund, Youth Study, Brownsville, N. Y.

THERESA KOHN is a teacher and curriculum consultant at the East Midwood Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N. Y. Contributions by her have appeared in the *Jewish Teacher* and THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

NATHAN A. BARACK is rabbi of Beth-El Congregation, Phoenix, Arizona and a contributing editor to THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

MARC H. TANENBAUM is a promising young writer whose stories have been appearing in the Anglo-Jewish press frequently. He is now on the staff of the Eternal Light radio program.

NOW ON RECORDS!

WHAT IS TORAH?

The widely produced, enthusiastically received

CANTATA

by JUDITH K. and IRA EISENSTEIN

Available in an album of 2 twelve-inch records

Recorded by the noted artist, Cantor Robert Segal and the Mt. Neboh Temple Choir.
$4.25 per album plus postage

Records together with text and music of the Cantata
$5.25 per album plus postage

ADVANCE ORDER BEING TAKEN NOW!

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... albums of "WHAT IS TORAH?" Check for $..... is enclosed.

Please send me ..... albums of "WHAT IS TORAH?" with music and text. Check for $..... is enclosed.

Name .....

Address .....

The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

Vol. XIV. April 29, 1948 Nisan 20, 5708 No. 6

EDITORIALS

"FROM SERVITUDE TO FREEDOM"

"WHEREAS, after twenty-seven years of an oppressive foreign regime that had received Palestine as a trust on behalf of the world to establish a national homeland for the Jews, that trust was not fulfilled;

"Now, therefore, the Jewish nation will establish its own state and independence in its homeland." . . .

In these words, the General Council of the World Zionist Organization, on April 12, 1948, announced its solemn decision. It was a momentous decision, fraught with grave consequences for Jewry not only in Eretz Yisrael but also in the diaspora. It was a hazardous decision. It meant defiance of all the sinister forces not only in the Arab world but also among the cabal of war lords, oil barons and cynical profiteers that today dominate the foreign policy of the United States and, through it, of all the nations dependent on American aid.

No other decision was possible. With Great Britain scheduled to surrender its Mandate on May 15th, and with no other scheme than partition available for implementation, it would have been the height of irresponsibility had the Executive Council not decided to proceed with the organization of the Jewish state. After the betrayal of the General Assembly's partition plan by the United States government, the General Council of the Zionists could certainly not give a blank check to the Security Council or the General Assembly to dispose at will of all the accrued assets of the Yishuv, accumulated on the basis of international pledges by twenty-seven years of toil, hardship and sacrifice. The trusteeship proposal is nothing but a plan to set up a police state in Palestine for an indefinite period, a state having no responsibility whatever to the people it governs and not committed in any way to the ultimate fulfilment of the pledges made by the nations to the Jewish people. For Jews to condone such international behavior would be apostasy. It would mean that we too worship at the shrine of Moloch and Mammon, whose priests today dominate the state departments and foreign offices of all the big powers. It would mean the total renunciation of the right of the Jewish people to a free and independent life anywhere in the world. It would mean equally a denial of the opportunity of Jewish religion to function as a civilizing agency in human affairs.

The General Council chose the right-

eous and dangerous course. The brunt of the dangers and sacrifices must be borne by the Yishuv. But—let there be no mistake — they must also be shared by the diaspora. American Jewry must give our fighting forces all the support they need. This is something we owe not only to the Jews of Eretz Yisrael, nor even exclusively to the Jewish people throughout the world. It is a duty we owe to mankind. The Haganah is today the only force that is fighting to maintain the prestige and authority of the United Nations against the aggression of the rebellious Arab states. Even our own American government (significantly without consulting the American people) has preferred the role of accomplice-after-the-crime of Arab aggression to that of resisting aggression.

For American Jewry to do its duty in this crucial time, it must be on guard against any tendency to defeatism or irresolution. Some of our Jews, yielding to wishful thinking, may be disposed to take at face value the protestations that the reversal of American policy was merely intended to make possible an ultimate solution of the Palestine problem based on mutual understanding after a period of trusteeship. Unfortunately, we have had experience with trusteeship. To put the lives and liberties of a people under the trusteeship of any militant empire with global strategic interests of its own is like putting a flock of sheep under a wolf for a shepherd.

Let no American Jew be deceived into imagining that the policy in reversal of partition represents the abiding purpose of America with which all loyal Americans must identify themselves. Overnight our Government reversed, by arbitrary fiat and without consulting Congress, what had been the repeatedly affirmed American policy ever since the Balfour Declaration, that of recognizing Jewish claims to a national home in Palestine. It gave no explanation for its reversal other than the transparent lie that it had not known that partition would require force for its implementation. Such arbitrary flouting of the considered judgment of the American people with regard to Jewish rights in Palestine is itself a tyrannical abuse of authority which all loyal Americans are bound to resent and resist.

Nor should American Jews permit themselves to be daunted by the thought that support of the Haganah and the Jewish state may arouse anti-Semitism in America. Even if it would—and in some circles it may—that would not justify a craven truckling to those who would oppress us. No doubt there will be men, some of them high in government councils, who will echo the vicious libels voiced by Hitler, Bevin and Abdullah, insinuating that the Jewish struggle for freedom is part of a Communist conspiracy. Nothing that we can do or refrain from doing will stop those libels. We cannot check anti-Semitism by appeasing anti-Semites. The more we submit to injustice, the more our enemies feel called upon to defame us in order to justify their abuse of us. If we now permit all our constructive labors to establish a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Eretz Yisrael to be frustrated, if we now let the world repudiate all its promises to us without standing up for our own rights, we will but invite contempt, abuse and oppression. If the Yishuv is not made secure against aggression, no Jewish community anywhere in the world can feel secure.

We are now celebrating our festival of freedom. Let us affirm our faith in God the Liberator, our faith that a brave devotion to freedom is a surer way to salvation than a cowardly yielding to aggression and injustice.

FIRST STEPS TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT

ASK people indiscriminately what they think about world government and you will receive three typical answers. One group will say: It *must* come now, or an atomic war will destroy our civilization. Another group answers: Yes, it *will* come—after the third world war; mankind is not yet ripe for it. A third group will respond: It will *never* come; man is an untamable beast.

Here you have in a nutshell human need and human nature. If you stress human need, you will affirm the advent of world government; if you stress human nature, you will become cautious or skeptical. Who is right?

We know that every country has had its key-dream. The eighteenth century dreamed of enlightenment, the nineteenth century of national self-determination; is the key-dream of our century world-government?

Before we find an answer, we must briefly say what we mean by world-government. World government does not abolish the existing national governments, as our Federal Government has not abolished the States, nor the British Commonwealth the Dominions, nor the Soviet Union its constituent national States. The different nations may preserve their various traditions and institutions, their forms of government, their economic systems, their ways of life, their national *sancta,* their anthems, their flags, their whole civilization. The world government will not take away anything of all that is sacred and time-honored from the people. It will only add something new that they had not before, that they will share with one another. The national currency may become a definite rate of a common currency, the national code part of an international code, the national army a unit of the international army and the national sovereignty will be completed by a world-wide sovereignty. We all shall live in two civilizations (or when we already live in two, as the Jews and the Catholics, we shall live in three civilizations). World government is a world civilization based on the orchestration of various national civilizations; it will be inclusive, not exclusive.

The United Nations, as at present constituted, is an association of sovereign governments which tries to settle some common difficulties cooperatively. It has no common code, no common currency, no common anthem, no common army. The building up of a world government is not as difficult as it would seem to be, once we define and qualify it as we have done. It is neither necessary nor desirable to wait for a third world war in order to start it, to propagate it and to implement it. Why shall we burn millions of people and scorch vast lands before we try to use our common sense?

The most efficient way to establish a world government is through public propaganda and education. Let us, the mightiest country on earth, begin. The others will follow if they see that we mean business. Our children should be told, in home and school: "Let us live, work and play together with all children of the world. If any starve in Asia or Europe, let us send them food; if they have no clothes, let us clothe them; if they want books, let us send books. Let us play and sing together; let us make laws and prevent crime together. Let us not hate them if they do not speak, behave or believe as we do." In all our schools, on all levels, we may dramatize the attitude of human solidarity, so that it sinks into the mind, the heart and the will of our youngsters.

By doing so, we transform public opinion and human nature imperceptibly but steadily, until, in the course of time, a

young generation will grow up to which the term world government will no longer be a distant ideal, but an urgent need, not a key-dream, but a key-necessity. Only in this efficient educational way can we realize the ideal of a warless society, the dream of all great religions.

Great things do not grow smoothly. There may occur obstacles and deadlocks, backsliding and troubles of all kind. Life is an adventure and a risk, full of dangers and pitfalls. Let us go ahead step by step without turn-about and misgivings. If we see we cannot win all the peoples at one time, let us start with a series of nations and make this new community of nations so impressive, attractive, efficient and useful that its success will make the others follow suit.

But what about the atom bomb and our fear of Russia? Let us forget about all this for a while. The less we talk about it, the better for us and the world. The new policy must be a policy of good and sound nerves. Hysteria and anxiety work like poison. As good doctors, let us live without poison. The nearer we reach our goal the more the atom bomb will lose in value and the better for us and the world. There is a wise old saying: "Do not touch iron when it is hot." Let us spend our time, our energy, our resources on the establishment of world government. That will bring us morale and moral leadership. That will bring us respect and even love. We are the land of the pioneers and free enterprise. Here is an opportunity for the greatest free enterprise in history, worthy of our boldest pioneers.

CONVENTION SEASON

THIS is convention time. In the spring, rabbis, social workers, center workers, and educators, in the Jewish field,—many other varieties of business and professional men and women in other fields—gather for their annual or biennial meetings. In ordinary times these meetings have been perfunctory, and much in the nature of ritual. But, clearly, our times are extraordinary in every sense, and it is gratifying to observe that the national organizations which serve American Jewry have taken cognizance of that fact. For the first time in many years, the convention programs reflect a keen awareness of the changing and challenging scene.

During the past week-end, the Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis conducted an Institute on Judaism and Civil Rights. In view of the recent report of the President's Committee, and the threatened revolt of certain southern leaders against any attempt to achieve equality of rights for all races, the meeting of this Institute in St. Louis takes on especial significance. It is encouraging to learn that the Rabbinical Assembly of America and the United Synagogue are also in the process of setting up a joint commission of social action to coordinate the activities hitherto carried on independently by the rabbis and the laity respectively. The project of a joint commission will be one of the subjects to come up for discussion at the forthcoming conventions of these two major Conservative groups.

The larger setting in which that discussion will take place, however, is of prime interest, namely, the broader issue of achieving a philosophy for Conservative Judaism. For many years now, the Conservative groups have alternated between formulating such a philosophy and avoiding its formulation. The Conservative group has found itself with such a wide range of divergent views represented within its ranks that to agree upon any philosophy has seemed almost like an impossibility. On the other hand, from

the younger rabbis, particularly, and more recently from an ever growing segment of the laity, there has emerged an urgent demand for a clarification of the Conservative position. Observers of Jewish internal life will do well to watch the conventions of the United Synagogue and the Rabbinical Assembly in Chicago next month.

Not the Conservatives only, however, have been groping for a common platform. The Jewish center movement, long in search of a philosophy, has come to the moment of decision. The well-known Janowsky report, which was based on an intensive study of Jewish center and YMHA work throughout the country, called for radical departures from past practice, and for definite commitment to a program of Jewish content. This report has been the subject of analysis and debate by local and regional groups within the Jewish Welfare Board for the past year. In Chicago next month, the Janowsky report will be finally acted upon. In the meantime, as our readers know, a new committee has challenged the conclusions of the Janowsky committee, and will submit a dissenting report at the convention. For this, if for no other reason, the JWB meeting should prove historic.

These evidences of revived concern with the basic issues of Jewish and general life are certainly heartening. Yet, the fact that so much of the activity of any group is carried on independently of the activity of every other creates a problem of coordination with which the major groups have not yet dealt. A recent letter from the Association of Jewish Chaplains to the leaders of the three main rabbinical bodies, therefore, makes an important suggestion. The chaplains appeal for simultaneous conventions in the same place of the three rabbinical associations, so that they may conduct at least one session jointly.

The chaplains properly call attention to the need "to set up bridges for effective intercommunication and cooperation among the three national rabbinical associations for the common good of Israel." They recall with much gratification their experiences in the armed forces, of serving the men as Jews, rather than as Reform, Conservative or Orthodox. This experience proved the need for thinking in broader terms, and avoiding sectarianism.

We hope that the appeal of the chaplains is heeded; but we hasten to warn the rabbinic groups that any joint session in the future will have to do better than the lone instance when the Rabbinical Assembly and the CCAR met in New York some years ago. So much time was taken by each group pointing up its own virtues and the weaknesses of its neighbors that it reminded some of the men of an unsuccessful good-will meeting.

And now, on to the conventions!

REALITIES AND VALUES

As reported by Victor Bernstein in the Sunday, April 18, edition of *PM*, a United States representative speaking before the Security Council on the American truce proposal, said: "The Jews and Arabs must get together in a Christian spirit."

Since neither of the parties is Christian, why should they get together in a *Christian* spirit?

And what, by the way, is a Christian spirt? Is it the spirit that says oil is more important than justice and right must yield to might?

How, one wonders, would the speaker react to this hypothetical situation? Assume that the Jewish people were represented in UN and a Jewish spokesman urged that the United States and Russia

compose their differences in a *Jewish* spirit.

▼

DID YOU IMAGINE THAT, AFTER the Nuremberg trials, genocide was recognized as a crime by all nations laying claim to civilization, all adjudged worthy of a place in the United Nations?

If you did, you were mistaken. On April 5, Karim Azkoul, representing the government of Lebanon declared, as reported in the *Congress Weekly* of April 16, that, in the view of his government, "destruction of a whole national or racial group may sometimes be a necessity for reasons of national defense or because the group itself has committed genocide."

What the spokesman for Lebanon justifies in theory, other Moslem states have put into practice. The *Congress Weekly* cites the Turkish massacre of the Armenians and the Iraquian massacre of the Christian Assyrians. Yet these nations are given seats in the United Nations, while the Yishuv is not deemed worthy of self-government and is still being kept under a trusteeship.

▼

RECENT STATISTICS SHOW that in all Poland there are today only 94,000 Jews. Yet Polish Jewry is still a force to be reckoned with as making for the preservation and development of Judaism. Polish Jewry is still shown to be rich in spirit, however weak it be in numbers.

The statistical report states that, in Poland the Jews maintain 31 cultural clubs, 26 dramatic groups, three people's universities, 12 choral groups, 13 libraries with 2,300 readers and 16,500 books, a theatrical school and a music school. There are also Jewish radio programs, a teachers seminary and a Jewish historical institute—a cultural and artistic society—with a membership of 4,000.

Most significant of all, this decimated and impoverished community has contributed 80,000,000 zlotys ($200,000) for the Jewish defense force in Eretz Yisrael.

Will American Jewry do relatively as well?

▼

AMERICAN JUDAISM IS COMING out of its shell and beginning to present its universal values in artistic form for the instruction and edification of the general public.

We have already had occasion to comment on the value of the Eternal Light radio program. Now the New York Board of Rabbis, through a committee consisting of Rabbis Louis Gerstein and Harold Gordon, has started negotiations with the executives of the Radio City Music Hall for the production of a Jewish religious pageant in connection with one of our Jewish holidays.

Similar Christian pageants have been produced in connection with Christmas and Easter in a very impressive manner, and the managing director of the theater, G. S. Eyssel and his administrative assistant, Jack F. Daily, expressed their

(*Continued on Page* 32)

CORRECTION

We are grateful to Mr. Carl Alpert, Director of the ZOA Department of Education for calling our attention to an error which appeared in this column in our last issue. We referred to the forthcoming dramatic production under the auspices of the ZOA by the title, "Sword in His Hand." It should have read, "Sword by His Side." As explained by Mr. Alpert, the error, which was taken from the source of our information, gives a title that has "connotations of militarism and aggression" but the correct title is taken from *Nehemiah* 4:11-12, "They that builded the wall and they that bore burdens laded themselves; every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other held his weapon; and the builders, every one had his sword girded by his side, and so builded."

Intercultural Education and Jewish Content

By WERNER J. CAHNMAN

ON the American Jewish scene of today, intercultural relations and interfaith activities are the concern of one group of persons and agencies and the promotion of Jewish content appears to be the concern of the other. As it has come about, the agencies working on the intercultural field, while sponsored preponderantly by Jews in the higher income brackets, are organized along non-sectarian lines. Examples are the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Bureau for Intercultural Education. As protagonists of the other camp are to be reckoned, apart from the purely religious bodies, the Jewish Education Commission and also, recently, the National Jewish Welfare Board. Although some leading personalities are active in both camps, by and large, the impression is created that the two positions are mutually exclusive. In actual fact, this is not the case. In particular, the Jewish Community Center provides a field of experimentation which may prove to be of crucial importance in demonstrating that both aspects belong together.

In this respect, the recent Report of the Commission on Survey of the National Jewish Welfare Board has missed the point. It was written under the assumption that things Jewish and things of civic cooperation and intercultural impact can and should be separated into compartments which one may open and close at will. Negatively, its attack on the monstrosity of the "non-sectarian Jewish centers, where the lights of the Sabbath Eve cannot be kindled because an Irish or Italian boy of the neighborhood happens to be somewhere in the building," is justified. But, since no constructive complementation has been attempted, this criticism has exposed itself to counter-attack on the charge of cultural reaction. Hence, we are still enmeshed in the old either-or. In the face of this, it should be possible to support the thesis that activities in the field of intercultural relations hold the key to a realistic Jewish content program as well as to a social action program in the Jewish Center. This would go a long way toward removing the present deadlock between those who believe that "social action" is the first and foremost cultural responsibility of the Jewish center and those who believe that "Jewish content" should take that place.

The Ambivalent Attitude of Our Youth

The reality of the situation which has to be faced in the Jewish center field is that Jewish youth of the second and third generations find themselves in a situation of ambivalence. They are drawn in two directions with equal force, and from that fact the need for combining the two aspects of their existence derives. Young American Jews are inescapably Jews and unavoidably Americans, but there is a deep gap between the two parts which constitute the whole.

Aside from this, each constituent part is in itself fraught with frustration. Jewish life in America, far from being considered "supplementary" to American life, as the recommendations of the Commission on Survey of the National Jewish Welfare Board would make us believe, is regarded rather as painfully contradictory to American life by the majority of Jewish youth in this country. This is par-

ticularly true in the densely settled Jewish districts of our metropolitan areas, where Jewish life looks as if it were identified with Yiddish linguistic expression and a petrified Orthodox practice. The development of the Palestine issue points in the same direction. This need not necessarily be so, but precious little has been provided to give concrete reality to an alternative philosophy of American Jewish life.

Generally, the primary experience of Jewishness in our society is that of an obstacle rather than a value. For those who come from Orthodox homes, this is aggravated by the fact that even the most genuine Jewish values, such as the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, have taken on the appearance of obstacles in an environment which has remained inflexible in the midst of a world of change. There are too many *dont's* and too few *do's*. For those who come from liberal homes, Jewish values seem to have evaporated altogether. To numerous young people in these brackets, it has become a matter of doubt why they should adhere stubbornly and to their disadvantage to a thing that resembles everything and nothing. On the other hand, the belief of young American Jews as Americans that "the pursuit of happiness" is an "inalienable right," and that happiness means essentially freedom of opportunity is contradicted by the actuality of American life which bars minority members from many of the most desirable opportunities.

Faced with this situation, Jewish young people in America are fleeing from the cold rejection of the outside world into the warm shelter of the Jewish center. But once in the center, they balk at what seem to them to be the implications of a Jewish content program. They are "good Jews," as the saying goes, but not because of any primary attachment to "Jewish culture" or a "Jewish way of life" which to them is past and gone, but because they have been rebuffed by the Gentiles and have rallied in defense of their interests and their aspirations. They feel that their coming together as Jews makes their activities "Jewish." What actually happens is that they draw together in order to create a replica of the larger American society in which they want to participate, but one which is meant for their own exclusive use and satisfaction. Thus, they are trying to effectuate a double escape.

However, the outside world continues to bother them incessantly. The actual social experience in urban centers and industrial areas is such that contacts with Gentiles are unavoidable. Most of them are in the character of inter-minority relations. By this we mean that Jews live in close proximity with Irish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Scandinavian-Americans and other ethnic groups rather than with the generalized Americans of the textbooks. In many instances, Negroes move in on a formerly Jewish neighborhood and create peculiar problems. Shall they be admitted to the gym? Sometimes they are and sometimes they are not. Sometimes the Youth Council is for their admission, but the Directors are against it. Another example is the attempt of young men of Italian descent in eastern seaboard cities to crowd in on a Jewish dance. Jewish mothers counsel their daughters to stay away. But uneasiness prevails, and there is a feeling that "something ought to be done about it."

This is even more true when tensions arise in some neighborhoods which result in gang warfare. There are regional differences, but the problem is always with us in one form or another. In the Far West, it is the Mexican and Oriental problem, in Canada, it is the French

problem which influences the civic position of the Jews as well as that of other minority groups. In the South, the Jews are enmeshed in the general racial pattern of the region. In the small towns all over the country, many of the Protestant churches are ready for cooperation, but their offerings rarely go beyond "get-together" parties of little value. At any rate, Jewish youth is in the trenches everywhere and asks for direction.

Intercultural Education the Key to a Solution

Such is the reality of intercultural relations on the grass roots level. If this observation is correct, valid conclusions may be reached for an intercultural program. The program which we have in mind bears scant resemblance to such publicity-saturated generalia as Brotherhood Week or Race Relations Sunday, which are now recognized all around as making hardly a dent on the situation. They merely sermonize our bad consciences into sweet complacency, but they do not touch the bad neighborhoods. Also, we should free ourselves from those conventional aspects of intercultural education which are merely the patched-up remnants of the old "Americanization" program that once was tailored to suit the needs of the immigrant generation. If intercultural education is little more than the continuation, by another name and for use with the first and second native-born generation, of the Americanization efforts of the melting pot variety, it is bound to fail for the same reasons which have made the philosophy of the melting pot increasingly inapplicable in recent decades. Intercultural activities that deserve the name presuppose the cultural consciousness of the participants and if this is so, they are likely to lead Jewish youth in particular, not only towards a better understanding of their position as citizens, but also toward a desire to learn more about the meaning of their heritage. At the same time, they entail a program of social action, trying to do something about the problems that trouble us most. They make for understanding as well as cooperation.

Here is the core of the entire argument. Inasmuch as understanding is concerned, intercultural activities, far from deflecting Jewish youth from their Jewish allegiance, rather directs them to it. Intercultural activities may well provide the Archimedic leverage by which a change of attitude will be effected also in the Jewish content field. There are signs that the expectation of such a change of attitude is in the mind, waiting only for the spark to set it off. The isolation of the individual in the modern world and the anxiety which springs from it make the desire to "belong" grow in him. This desire may take the shape of faddish antics, but it is not likely to be satisfied by them. There is a Jewish experience throughout the ages which Jewish youth is dimly conscious of and wishes to grasp more fully again. It is not brought home to them. Jewish teachings have the air of remoteness about them. In this country, they seem to confront young people with a choice between Jewishness and Americanism, which they cannot take. As things stand now, therefore, Jewish youth, from the temporary refuge of the Jewish center, try to play down their Jewishness for fear of not being accepted as Americans if they did otherwise. If, however, in the course of a lively exchange of opinion and information with a Gentile group, they are led to the point where they are challenged to formulate their fears and hopes, to interpret their background, and finally, perhaps, to reenact their collective experiences, all of which are essentially Jewish, the mechan-

ism of stimulus and response is likely to work in favor of greater Jewishness. By accepting the challenge, their reputation will be enhanced if they perform well; they will be accepted for what they are. In other words, Jewish values, instead of being handed down as a packaged message, will be exposed to re-evaluation in a natural setting. Thus, the psychological block will be removed which now prevents the second growth of cultural consciousness.

Bridging the Gap Between Social Action and Jewish Content

To oppose a Jewish content program to a social action program tears the hearts of Jewish youth asunder and forces them to follow the stronger attraction. But this opposition is actually being advanced in a number of instances. Many Jewish educators and rabbis with good intentions are in the ranks of those who, by raising this false dilemma, do more harm than good. Under conditions which seem more different from those here than they actually are, the issue has until recently been painfully sharp in Palestine and has alienated a large segment of Jewish youth there from the Jewis religion. Jewish youth is sensitive to the same thing here.

While it is true that "social action" may often denote but one of the many avenues of escape on which the modern Jew travels, the charge that one often hears from young people, namely that "Jewish content" sometimes turns out to be little more than social reaction in disguise, is unfortunately not without foundation.

However, this need not necessarily be so. If we shake off the Ghetto mentality, there is nothing in the teachings of Judaism which need prevent Jewish youth in America from cooperating with other young Americans in the wide field of civic issues, starting with neighborhood improvement and ending with support of the United Nations. Nor is there reason to think that the Jewish center is not a sufficiently "American" place for Jewish and Gentile youth to meet in support of a good cause. What the YMCA can do, the Jewish center can do also and, in doing so, it can make a distinctly Jewish contribution to the emerging civilization of America.

Such a contribution is not only possible but becomes necessary as soon as Jewish institutions begin to intensify their Jewish activities. Logically and psychologically, therefore, Jewish content programs and social action programs must complement each other, if they are not to defeat their own purpose. This is involved in the situation of Jews in a Gentile world. It is a recognized truth in the world of fund-raising. Nobody knows this better than the Jewish businessmen in small and medium-sized communities all over the country who serve on the boards of Jewish centers and are active in other Jewish as well as civic institutions, movements, and drives. If they collect large sums for the U.J.A. campaign, or even for a new center building, they know that they must also spend large sums for general local causes or else they expose themselves to the criticism of the home folks on the ground that they neglect their civic duties. It should be understood that what is true of these fund-raising activities, is also true of cultural endeavors.

The Problem of Method

All this poses the problem of method rather sharply; and behind the problem of method lurks the problem of personalities. The complexity of the processes described makes it imperative that the proposed intercultural program be preceeded and accompanied by research.

The interplay of causes and effects, which has been tentatively outlined above, must be more securely established, variations and modifications ascertained, and results achieved in one place checked against those in another, in order to give the evolving program a firmer anchorage. But the methods employed in this sort of research need not be too rigid; they will rather be the by-product of what is otherwise a "demonstration program" and hence be dictated by the requirements and objectives of such a program. In other words, research and program planning and, again, program execution and research findings will appear as two sides of one and the same thing.

It follows that the proposed research should be "field research." It should be carried on in agencies and neighborhoods which might serve as social experiment stations. Questionnaires may be used and tests need not be excluded, but working in "artificial climates" should be avoided. The setting should be as normal as possible. Which is to say that most of the research will have to be done in day-by-day association, in small-group discussion and in non-directive as well as in guided interviews.

It follows further that the proposed research should be "action research." On the one hand, it should be carried on among the normal activities of the agencies concerned; on the other, it should be devised to change the arrangement and the direction of existing attitudes and to make new activities possible. The new activities may take the form of meetings, discussion groups, movies, visits to places of interest, dramatic presentations, holiday celebrations and music. In any event, the agencies selected should have staffs that are fully cooperative and youth groups which are generally interested in these activities. Finally, there should be a suitable non-Jewish institution that could be asked to participate in a joint program.

The program will have to be approached differently for teen-agers and for young adults. Teen-agers are difficult, but young adults are neglected. Teen-agers must be led into action rather quickly, while young adults are ready to experiment with new ways and forms of collective learning.

Also, the approach to the program will have to be different in a metropolitan region than in smaller or medium-sized towns. In many metropolitan districts, where Jews settle in compact masses, Jewish youth is still trying to break away from the ghetto, but their actual contacts are almost entirely Jewish. Where Jews live as a scattered minority in the country, intermingling with Gentiles is much easier, but a longing awakens in isolation for a return to the roots of Jewish existence. Even within a metropolitan region, such as New York, the patterns of Jewish living as well as the ones of neighborhood relations vary and will require a somewhat flexible approach. If the partners are White Protestants, it will be advisable to stress "religion," while with Catholics, and perhaps also with Negroes, ethnic backgrounds are rather to be emphasized. However, all these are shades and grades within a single continuum.

The Problem of Personnel

The problem of personalities is much more complex than the problem of methods. One may say that any method may serve if a suitable personality is at hand, while, without such a personality, the best method will work only inadequately. In our departmentalized world, we are lacking such personalities. There are many requirements which should be kept in mind. The researcher and discussion leader should be a trained social scientist, but he should appear as an auxiliary staff

person. He should be as little opinionated as humanly possible and rather capable of following carefully all the whims and wishes of those with whom he is engaged in discussion, so that he is led by them in the direction of their major problems and interests. It is possible that the discussion will start with childhood and family experiences, but more likely that it will set in with problems of neighborhood tensions and neighborhood improvement. The latter will soon be widened into national problems, such as those of discrimination and prejudice. Recently, Palestine has been, and will probably continue to be, an exciting topic. The discussion leader must be conversant with the general aspect of all these experiences and problems and, in addition, he should be able to discuss them with people of different derivation. Only occasionally, will the group he deals with be an ethnically or denominationally mixed one from the beginning; more often, a separate start will have to be made with two groups that are in themselves homogeneous and the moment will have to be caught when both are ready to exchange opinion and experience. In either case, the complexity grows, as the area of cultural expression is reached. The background of thought and sentiment of each participating group should then be familiar.

It is here that "Jewish content" has its proper place. But there are two major requirements. First, a mere routine mastery of the traditional subjects, such as Hebrew, Bible, History, will not suffice. There must be such love of things Jewish as to carry conviction and to inspire ingenious innovation and combination. With the fences of the Torah broken down, Jewish learning must start again *mibereshit,* that is, with the work of creation. Second, there must be an ability, which is commonly lacking even in our best-trained Jewish personnel, namely the ability to lift Jewish matters out of their Ghetto-like isolation and to put them into the stream of world history and current events. The familiar must be used to open a vista of the things that are more distant, and the distant must be made to shed a new light on the things that have become too familiar. Our sages once said that a misfortune which befalls Israel but not "the nations" is no misfortune; only a misfortune which befalls Israel *and* the nations, deserves the name. This is even more true now. Modern Judaism is neither a tight compartment nor is it "supplementary" to modern civilization. It is part and parcel of it.

I am quite aware of the fact that these remarks cover a wide field and that they are merely introductory. In order to avoid a possible misunderstanding, let me say that I have selected activity in the field of "Intercultural Relations" not because I think there are no other things to do, but because we touch here upon a source from which many rivulets and even streams of creative social change may eventually flow. One of these streams will carry "social action," another "Jewish content" and a most important one will carry "*Jewish* social action." But there are also other possible starting points for cultural programming which should be the concern of the Social Experiment Station mentioned above. The requirements of the program are so great that no one of the now existing agencies can hope to cope with them. But a start can be made at one place or another, wherever research and program planning can be combined.

A local agency of means and good standing might serve this purpose, but it could also be served by a national agency, provided that the work was merely being coordinated at a desk, while it was

being carried on locally with and among the people themselves.

We have now, for instance, a Training Bureau for Jewish Social Workers. But, significantly enough, up to now the program of the Bureau has made no provision for contemporary Jewish social studies, to be aided by field reports of the advanced students who participate in the program. This is as if one were to learn anatomy from Greek statues or botany by viewing Central Park from the top floor of Rockefeller Center. One may ask: how can we devise a therapy, if we do not have a diagnosis? And how can we hope to have a diagnosis, if we do not concern ourselves with the here and there? Obviously, if we do not know the needs and desires of our clientele, we cannot serve them properly, nor can an institution hope to survive if it does not cater adequately to those needs and desires. Certainly, no program of Jewish survival in our time can take another point of departure than one which is indicated by the needs of the Jewish individual.

These then are our conclusions: We should have a central Institute of Jewish Social Studies. Lacking that, we should at least make a beginning somewhere and with regard to some aspect of the entire problem of Jewish reconstruction in America, hoping that from the beginning, there will be a subsequent growth through imitation and combination. The place should be one of academic distinction that would do justice both to theoretic formulation and practical application. The aspect which is most likely to force the integrative effort into a single focus is the one of intercultural education.

Retrospect in Wrath

By MARC H. TANENBAUM

BACK in the narrow cramped streets of Jerusalem's Bet Yisrael Quarter they still talk about it in a kind of hushed amazement.

Some say it happened early on the first night of Pesah. Some say it was much later in the evening. But most of them agree that this is how it took place:

It was right after that series of terrific explosions which rocked the entire marketplace. While bulging clouds of smoke cascaded high above the center of the city, and the snipers' bullets whined relentlessly criss-crossing the square, Lance Corporal Michael Hannon of the Royal Fusiliers limped along one of the twisting medieval street-ways far behind the scene of explosion.

The bomb concussion had dazed him and he was groggy from a blow on the head. As he reached the far end of Rehov Rahamim (the "Street of Compassion"), he collapsed, falling prostrate across the narrow pavement, his head against the wooden door of the silent house, his feet dangling over the gutter.

And in the darkness of that night, made even darker by the billows of dirty fire-smoke which came from afar, this is what they say happened: The wooden door of the silent house suddenly creaked open, and there was the voice of a frightened woman: "Mah zot? Mah zot?"—then a choked "ach!" . . . Abba, bo henna . . . . bo henna. . . ."

Two strong arms in a white shirt reached out and dragged in the wounded form in khaki. Behind the bolted door, on a cot in the corner of the darkened room, there was the rustle of a jacket be-

ing removed, the swish of a sponge in water, the excited muttering of instructions. And to the tall, strong man, his diminutive wife, and the little girl who stood bewildered at the foot of the cot, there came a groan of pain from the man on his back.

But as the people of Bet Yisrael tell it, Lance Corporal Hannon soon emerged from his stupor, sat up on the cot, and looked up blankly at his benefactors. Then through the doorway of the other room, they say, he beheld the soft glow of lights on a table, and suspicion was on his face. "What's going on here? What are you doing?"

He remembered like a sharp pain what some of his squad buddies had told him about the kidnappings, and the third-degree questionings by the Jewish underground in dimly-lit cellars, and the truncheon beatings.

"We are celebrating a seder," the man said in accented English, "this is the first night of Passover."

The woman invited him to come to the table.

"What?"

"Won't you come with us to the table?" she repeated. And they helped the corporal to a seat at the white table with the glittering dishes and the blinking candles.

"Here, have some wine," and the man offered a golden goblet.

"No, no thanks. . . ." He paused, then said, "Yes, I will take some." When he put the goblet on the table, he said with curiosity: "This holiday, I've heard about it . . . it deals with Jewish freedom, doesn't it?"

And the tall man with the gaunt face looked into the corporal's eyes, then sighed. "Freedom . . . it seems incredible with all that is going on outside our door . . . but we *are* celebrating Jewish freedom . . . the freedom which began. . . ." And he told the corporal the story of Pharaoh and his oppression of Jews, and how they finally gained their freedom, and then he started to tell him about Hitlerite Germany from which he, his wife, and little girl had been liberated. And they could see the corporal tighten his jaw, for he had just glanced at the little girl's arm which passed him the matzos, and saw the bluish numbers which were seared into her flesh. . . .

There was a moment of embarrassed silence. The corporal stared into the candlelights, then at the dishes with all the symbolic foods which the man had spoken about. He looked up at the faces of the little girl, the mother, the man, and groping for words he said hesitantly:

"I understand . . . I understand everything you've said . . . you see, I'm an Irishman, my dad was in the Irish rebellion . . . and I know what it means to be pushed around, to have to fight bigger guys for your freedom. . . ." And his voice trailed off into silence as the vision of the dirty smoke and flying splinters and flashes of gunfire seemed to separate the man in khaki at one end of the table from the man, woman, and little girl at the other end.

He looked again at the little girl and her arm now covered by the long sleeve of the silk blouse, and he remembered the disembarkments at Haifa, the old rabbi, the pregnant woman being shoved down the gangplank, the mutilated bodies of Jewish boys he found in the wadi, and his commanding officer's order to "first blast these bloody Jews, then ask questions!"

"I hate all this . . . believe me, I hate every minute of it all. . . ." And the corporal felt a catch in his throat, a lump, and he softly added, "I'm sorry, I've interfered with your Seder . . . please continue, won't you. . . .?"

The father nodded to his wife and the little girl, then stood up with the book in

his hand. "We are reading in Hebrew on page twenty-nine . . . you may read with us in English. . . ."

And together the man, the woman, and the little girl began to read: *"Shefok hamatka al hagoyim asher lo yedaooka. . . ."* And in an audible whisper Lance Corporal Hannon read the translation:

"Pour forth Thy wrath upon the nations who have not recognized Thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon Thy Name. . . ."

The Impact of the Jewish State on Jewish Education in America

By THERESA KOHN

In our last issue, we referred to the instructive seminar conducted by the Reconstructionist Youth Fellowship on the general theme, "The Impact of the Jewish State on Jewish Life in America." This is one of the papers read at the Seminar. We hope, in due course, to publish some of the other papers, which treat other aspects of the general theme.

NOT long ago an activity program was introduced into the public schools of New York. So far it has had little educational effect on the children. Its failure has been due not so much to inherent weaknesses as to the fact that those who were to implement the program were not at all clear as to its aims. Educational change is more than a change in method; it is a type of social change. It represents a change in people's thinking and in their ways of behaving. Because education has not been thought of sufficiently in terms of social change, it has helped but little in meeting the problems and challenges of society today.

In order to discuss changes in Jewish education in America likely to result from the impact of the Jewish state, we must consider the extent that the attitudes and ways of thinking of the American Jew have been or might be affected. Dr. Kaplan suggests in his book, "The Future of the American Jew," that the conventional educational procedure must be reversed in American Jewish education. Instead of social change preceding the educational process, the educational process must be used to bring about the necessary social change. If our schools are to create new ways of thinking and effect changes in the structure of the Jewish community, then at least those who are engaged in educational work must themselves have undergone changes in their thinking. The question, then, that we are here to discuss, resolves itself first of all into this: Have there been or are there likely to be any changes in our concepts, as a result of the impact of the Jewish state, that might indicate the groundwork for educational change? If so, what influence might such changes have on (1) the scope of Jewish education, (2) educational materials, (3) personnel, and (4) school organization and educational structure.

It is hard to distinguish between changes resulting directly from the birth of the Jewish state and those resulting from the general increase of interest in Eretz Yisrael. This increased interest has been aroused largely by the issue of Jewish statehood being brought so dramatically and so poignantly to public attention. It also can be considered, therefore, as an effect of the birth of the state. It may very well be that after a Jewish state has actually been achieved and Eretz Yisrael moves away from the headlines,

there will be some decline in the effect on the American Jewish community. However, even those more superficial and less abiding interests can serve perhaps as a springboard for a jump forward in Jewish education.

The issue of the Jewish state has forced the American Jew to face some problems which until now it may have been possible for him to evade. It has brought to the attention of American Jewry certain fundamental questions which can no longer be left unanswered.

Possible Changes in Thinking of American Jews

The first is the question of what we are—the position of the American Jew. The problem of dual loyalties can no longer be considered a hypothetical one. Even the President of the United States has allegedly made a statement that Zionists (New York Zionists, anyway) are "disloyal." Lessing Rosenwald and his friends, who have been telling us so for a long time, have become particularly articulate of late. Obviously some clarification of the position of the American Jew is necessary.

It is not laymen alone who are vague about this question. Many of our teachers and educators have been equally noncommital and evasive. Some are European-born teachers who are not sufficiently familiar with the American scene to be able to understand the problem clearly. Others, though brought up in America, are themselves the product of European-trained teachers and tend to perpetuate the same type of education they themselves received.

There are two main directions in which the need for defining Jewish position has been leading and both have considerable implications for educational change. The first is the response of *shelilat hagalut,* denial of the Diaspora, the conviction that only in Eretz Yisrael can Jews continue to exist as a people. The second is that of Reconstructionism, which affirms that Judaism is a religious civilization having Eretz Yisrael as its creative center but including diaspora Jewry as well. It affirms that, in the diaspora, Jews live within two civilizations and that it is both possible and desirable for them to do so.

It is not necessary here to discuss the pros and cons of these two outlooks. I shall assume that, as members or prospective members of the Reconstructionist Youth Fellowship, we have already thrashed out the problem on other occasions. Here we are concerned with it primarily as an expression of trends in the thinking of American Jewry which may have implications for the future of Jewish education in America. Just how these attitudes will affect Jewish education will be discussed somewhat later.

The issue of the Jewish state has also forced us to redefine some of the terms which have been thrown around a great deal but about which very few people, Jews or non-Jews are very clear. Foremost among these are *nationalism* and *democracy.* The challenge to rethink these concepts has come from two directions: first, our position as Jews in America and the question of dual loyalties that has been mentioned, and secondly, the kind of nation and the kind of government we wish to see set up in Eretz Yisrael. To this might be added the question of whether the whole idea of nationalism is not outmoded, whether, as some people claim, we are not trying to fit ourselves into an erroneous and decadent social structure. As we rethink these concepts, there are bound to be educational repercussions. Although these are problems with which the American public school also must be concerned, we cannot afford to rely on it entirely to

do the job. As Jews we have more at stake in the realization of democratic ideals than has the average citizen. Moreover, our understanding of ourselves and our position depends largely on our understanding of what these terms mean.

Besides focusing our attention on the meaning of democracy and nationalism, the formation of the new Jewish state raises the question also of implementation. How are these concepts implemented in the founding of a state? Since we are not citizens of that state we are not directly confronted with the problem, and the extent to which we have a right to use our influence in its solution is debatable. Nevertheless, our concern for the future of the Jewish state will cause us to watch with interest how such matters as the relationship between church and state, minority rights, collectivism, political structure, etc., will be handled by the Yishuv. In doing so, we will draw on our experiences with American democracy as a guide in thinking through the problems of the new state and will be able more and more to draw on the experiences of the Jewish state in understanding and meeting some of our own problems of American democracy.

As we are brought face to face with the challenge of defining our position as Jews and as we rethink some of our social concepts, we realize the need for changes in Jewish education that would help it both to keep pace with the changes in our thinking and to effect necessary changes in Jewish community life. As already indicated, these changes are likely to manifest themselves in the scope, the type of materials, the type of personnel, and the structural organization of education.

Influence of Changing Concepts on the Scope of Education

Whether the reaction to the question of Jewish status is one of denial or of affirmation of the possibility of living as a people in the diaspora will affect considerably the scope of Jewish education in America. An obvious corollary to the denial of diaspora Judaism is that education should be directed toward the end of *aliyah,* of actual migration to Eretz Yisrael. The curriculum of the school, in order to facilitate achievement of this goal would be centered almost exclusively in Eretz Yisrael, its historic role, the Zionist movement, the achievements of the modern Yishuv, and the Hebrew language. It would include the study of other Jewish communities mainly insofar as their story would relate to Zionism, the need for Eretz Yisrael, and the inadequacy of diaspora Judaism.

The second outlook would necessitate a curriculum that would include all other aspects of Jewish civilization — religion, folk-ways, the arts, history, Jewish communal life and its institutions—as well as Eretz Yisrael and the Hebrew language and literature. Since Eretz Yisrael is the core of Jewish civilization, its study and the study of Hebrew would naturally assume positions of prominence. But although *aliyah,* whether permanent or for a temporary period of service, might well be included as a legitimate and desirable goal, it would not overshadow the fundamental purpose of training for active and intelligent participation in the life of the American Jewish community and for a wholesome integration of American and Jewish experiences and values.

Concern with the meaning of nationalism and democracy also affects the scope of Jewish education. If we believe that living in both the American and Jewish civilizations is a normal expression of the democratic concept, and that the two experiences are interrelated, that they do not exist side by side in isolation, then the program of the school, too, must

represent an integration of the two civilizations. The celebration of the American holidays, for example, must be incorporated within the Jewish school, and Jewish children must be made aware that the American heritage is *their* heritage. Not only must the history of the Jews in America be taught; it must be taught not merely as the story of Jews who came to America, but as the story of the interwoven pattern of American life and the threads of Jewish civilization that run through it.

The opportunity for reciprocal influence of democratic developments in America and in the Jewish state, also enlarges our educational horizon. It encourages greater emphasis on interpreting Jewish values and experiences in universal terms and on utilizing universal values in directing and interpreting Jewish experience. By helping us to relate what we teach to life and to life's problems, the experience of the Jewish state might help make Jewish education relevant to living in a modern world. It may provide a medium for the teaching of democratic values, by enabling us to see democracy as it is initiated, democracy "in the raw" before it becomes so complex as to become almost incomprehensible. It enables us also to understand Jewish values as functioning within a social framework instead of a vacuum.

Influence on Educational Materials

One of the biggest and most frequent complaints of Hebrew school teachers (and they have very big and very frequent complaints) is the dearth of materials. Although this lack has the advantage of leaving a teacher free from the shackles of textbook instruction and prescribed syllabi, it places an almost insurmountable difficulty in her way and, I dare say, has driven many a teacher out of the field. As we broaden the scope of Jewish education, the demand for suitable materials becomes even greater. To what extent might the Jewish state help us to meet this need?

It obviously cannot do the job for us, not even if we were to commit ourselves to an exclusively Palestine-oriented program. Eretz Yisrael material would need considerable adaptation in language and in frame of reference to be at all meaningful to the American-reared child. If we accept the outlook that Judaism is the civilization of the entire Jewish people and consequently broaden considerably the scope of education, we certainly canot lean primarily on Palestinian material. Nevertheless a close relationship between America and the Yishuv can be of tremendous help to those of us in America who are faced with the problem of creating and gathering together much-needed material.

Already, particularly since the close of the war, we have been receiving materials which are of great help, not so much for instruction in a particular area (their textbooks, from what I gather from a superficial acquaintance with them, are as bad as our own), as in making vivid the vague and distant concept of Eretz Yisrael. Not so long ago, I spent an evening at the home of one of my students. I had visited a relative of the family while in Eretz Yisrael this summer. Although, the two families had hardly maintained contact before the war, they keep up a steady communication now by correspondence and through visitors to and from Eretz Yisrael. Relatives, particularly when an ocean lies between you and them, are a great help—educationally at least. In the course of the evening, I was shown a cabinet of Palestinian art objects, we listened to Hebrew records sent from Eretz Yisrael, and the daughter and I read and discussed in Hebrew the Hebrew directions to a game she had just received.

She had spent the earlier part of the day with two other members of the Hebrew class trying to figure them out. They probably learned more Hebrew from this attempt than from many an assignment that had been given them.

Palestinian newspapers, although linguistically too difficult for our children, do much to drive home the point that Hebrew is a living language. There is something very vivid about looking up the movie page and deciphering in the Hebrew characters, as we did in class one day, the name of "Johnny Weismuller in Tarzan" and in seeing pictures of American Quiz Kids and reading the account of some of the questions that were asked them.

One of the things in Eretz Yisrael today that strike the visitor's attention is the number of children's periodicals displayed on the news stand (*Davar La-yeladim, Tzofeh La-yeladim,* everything for the *yeladim.*) Although most of this material is written in language too difficult for our children, much of it could be adapted for them. Mention should be made also of the great amount of material which various Palestinian agencies have been putting out specifically for diaspora consumption. Recently, for example, an English-language publication called *Vista* has come out, intended for American children. Films and the pamphlet literature put out by Keren Kayemet, Keren Hayesod and Histadrut are also very useful. If under present conditions the Yishuv can develop so much material, when—*im yirtzeh ha-shem*—it has peace and leisure for such pursuits, it will undoubtedly be able to help us in our quest for educational materials.

Influence on Teaching Personnel

Perhaps the most serious problem with which Jewish education is faced is the lack of sufficient leadership. For those who focus their entire educational program on *aliyah,* on actual immigration to Eretz Yisrael, the problem of educational personnel may be greatly reduced by an influx of *shelihim,* representatives of the Yishuv, either official or unofficial. For those of us who are concerned not only with the development of the Jewish state and of the aid we can give it but also with the creation of a thriving Jewish community in America, the Jewish state alone will not be the answer. It is a sound principle of education that one must start with the child where he is, and if his teacher is not and has never been in the same place where he is, it is almost impossible for that teacher to guide his education, to understand his needs, and to work with him in meeting them.

Although the ultimate responsibility for the guidance and training of American Jews must rest primarily with American Jews, trained in American schools and deeply rooted in American life, the creation of a Jewish state will indirectly affect educational leadership in America. First of all, the presence here of members of the Yishuv will help bridge the distance between the continents. They can help interpret Eretz Yisrael to American Jews, instill in them some of their spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to the Jewish people, and imbue them with the social and spiritual values which the Jewish state in the course of its growth will foster and develop.

Besides providing us with additional resource people, the Jewish state will also exert great influence on our own American-trained leaders. The reason why so few of our American Jewish youth select Jewish education or any type of Jewish communal service as their life work, or, having selected it, seldom remain in it for long, is largely a matter of morale. There is little feeling of solidarity or of social acceptance. The professional Jew, and

particularly the teacher, is looked upon as a rather odd phenomenon not only by non-Jews but even by most of the Jews he meets. He feels alone, and it is hard to face alone the difficulties that stand in the way of reclaiming the wasteland that is American Jewish life. The creation of a Jewish state makes his position less anomalous, because it makes the Jewish people less of an anomaly. As Jewish peoplehood becomes more comprehensible, the Jew who is concerned about his people and his people's future becomes more understandable. He crosses that hazy border-line from the eccentric to the social idealist. Most of us, somehow, feel a little more comfortable in the second category.

The Jewish state also provides the necessary feeling of solidarity. The feeling that there are others who are concerned about our work is tremendously strengthened when one takes a trip to Eretz Yisrael. I found, on the whole, despite the tendency on the part of the Yishuv to minimize the possibilities for anything but dollar Judaism in America, a surprising and genuine appreciation of our educational accomplishments. If the proposal made at the World Conference on Jewish Education in Jerusalem this summer for a year's study in Eretz Yisrael as preparatory to educational service in America would be carried out, morale as well as the professional qualifications would be much higher. If the Jewish state will provide opportunities for bringing together teachers and educators and for maintaining direct contact with them, it may have considerable effect on stimulating and inspiring those already in the field and encouraging others to devote themselves to Jewish education.

Influence on School Organization and Educational Structure

Insofar as the issue of Jewish statehood affects our concept of the function of Jewish education in America, it should also affect the way we organize for educational purposes. Are our schools so constructed as to serve these broader purposes of training for living as Jews within the framework of American democracy? Does the organizational structure lend itself to democratic relationships and to democratic processes?

Democratic values cannot be taught within an authoritarian framework, and there is still much that is authoritarian in our educational structure. In our attempts to build up effective organization, we have tended to lean on the Public School for guidance—a sort of more mature big brother. There is, of course, much that we can learn from the American educational system in our, as yet, pioneering attempts in Jewish education. But this has its dangers also. The American Public School was set up to serve the purpose of training for literacy, screening for leadership and certifying proficiency in skill subjects. It has become quite clear that it has not served the newer purpose of training for democratic social behavior. It is very difficult to superimpose these new purposes on the old set-up. Perhaps the new Jewish state, setting out with these purposes clearly in mind, will be able to infuse some fresh blood in our educational structure.

Since we conceive of the school as a type of social structure, it does not seem improbable that the Yishuv which has contributed so much in new social patterns might be a source also for new ideas in this area. The cooperative movement has already influenced the organization of some of our educational camps; it might influence also the organization of the school. It might suggest new ways of cooperative activity within the classroom, among the staff, with the parent body,

and with the institutions with which our schools are connected. The organization of a cooperative school might also help set into motion cooperative Jewish community organization.

Jewish education in America is the task of American Jewry. It must meet needs that are unique to our own problem of living in two civilizations. It must be an outgrowth of our experience as Jews and Americans. A Jewish state cannot do the job for us, but it can make it possible for us to do what would otherwise be a hopeless job.

It Happens Every Day in Jewish Middletown

By BEN ZEVI DAVID

MR. Irving Goldstein came to live in Jewish Middletown ten years ago. He came from Brooklyn, N. Y. (Honest, no offense meant. Why *are* Brooklynites so sensitive?) Why he left Brooklyn I'll never know. That he had money was quite obvious; he bought the large corner store in the heart of the business district. He bought a home in one of Middletown's fashionable suburbs. He became a member of the Jewish country club and joined the Conservative congregation, where he was immediately made a member of the Board of Directors.

Ten years have passed since Mr. Goldstein came to live in our midst. He is, by now, one of the best-known characters in town. (In Middletown, when they say "character," they mean a person who is completely unspoiled by conventional behavior and who is quite oblivious of public opinion—a person who is natural, naturally crude, vulgar, yet fascinating.) Goldstein's business has prospered tremendously; the corner store has become one of the busiest establishments in the city, the fashion center for Middletown's discriminating shoppers. He has become a power to be reckoned wtih in the local Chamber of Commerce. When Goldstein says that late closing should be changed from Saturday night to Friday night, he carries the day without too much difficulty. (When his Rabbi says, "Mr. Goldstein, Friday night! The only night when our people get to services," Goldstein looks surprised and replies, "Rabbi, believe me, I forgot Friday night was Shabbos"). He is now chairman of the all-important House Committee at the Country Club and is responsible for bringing some of the choicest baked hams and delicious lobsters into the Club's cuisine. But the post he prizes most is that of chairman of the Membership Committee of the Conservative Synagogue. For in addition to the prestige that it carries, it gives him a remarkable opportunity to display his talent for leadership.

No one can become a member of the Synagogue unless he is first approved by Goldstein. Who, after all, knows better than he who is suitable for membership in this swank congregation? "Let me tell you, gentlemen," Goldstein tells the Board in his best Milt Grossian English, when a Board member has proposed some salaried salesman for membership, "fifty dollar members you can get by the bushel. Who wouldn't become a member for fifty dollars? But I tell you it's a mistake. If you want to fill the synagogue with junk, that's your business; but you can't run this kind of an institution with such members. We want a high class rabbi and a high class cantor, don't we? We want to have high class merchandise to

sell, yes? Then we must have high class members. If you take any one in for less than a hundred dollars, you'll ruin our synagogue." And Goldstein's logic being unassailable and his business acumen beyond reproach (look what he accomplished in ten years!), the lower classes must perforce look for their religious merchandise in some less exclusive and expensive establishment.

Unconsciously, Goldstein is aware of the maxim, *noblesse oblige.* As a leader of the synagogue he feels it his duty to attend services on Saturday mornings. He is there promptly at nine o'clock when the services start, but he is never there at the end. No matter what point in the services it may be, exactly at eleven o'clock Goldstein doffs his *talit,* folds it neatly, and slinks quietly out of the synagogue. It was not necessary for the rabbi to call Goldstein to account about this irregularity of conduct. Goldstein called the rabbi to account. "You see, I like to come to services Saturday morning, but how long can I stay? After all, I have my business. That's the trouble with you rabbis: you think people have nothing else to do but spend the whole day in Shul. We're business men and we have to make money so that we can pay your salary. Let me tell you something, rabbi, you streamline this service so that we can get out in an hour and I guarantee you we'll pack the place every Saturday. So we won't say all the prayers. Nobody cares about them anyway."

That Goldstein's thoughts are not directed entirely to his prayers is evidenced by some snatches of conversation which have been overheard and repeated. Mrs. Cohen relates that when her daughter joined her one Saturday morning in the synagogue, Mr. Goldstein leaned over and, in a whisper that caused every worshiper to turn around, said, "Do you know that we just opened a Junior Miss department in our store? Bring your daughter in and we'll fix you up." He was generous, too, in his own inimitable manner. The ceremony of taking out the Torah was going on and the cantor was facing the congregation with the Holy Scroll in his hands. But Goldstein's thoughts were elsewhere. He was looking intently at the rabbi's wife and then a great decision was born in him. He edged over to Mrs. Rabbi and as the cantor was singing, *"Shema Yisroel,"* he gently inquired, "Do you have a charge account in my store?" The *rebbitzin* was horrified, but, after all, Mr. Goldstein! Without turning her head, she nodded. Thus encouraged, Goldstein went on, "But have they been giving you our discount for special customers?" This was more than the rabbi's wife could stand. As the procession was making its way around the *bimah,* she turned to him and said, "I don't like to talk about these things in the synagogue, Mr. Goldstein, see me some other time." Mr. Goldstein was astounded and in a tone of amazement said, "But this is business!" (And, after all, Mrs. Rabbi, what could be more sacred in this world than business?)

Yes, Mr. Goldstein came to this little town ten years ago and it looks as if he's here to stay. And, mark my words, he's really going places in this town. He plays a good game of golf, is one of the best pinochle, bridge and gin rummy players in town, dances the rhumba like a young bobby-soxer. So he doesn't speak such a good English. So he isn't the most educated man in town. But he is a big success in business and he's somebody to be reckoned with in the Jewish community. In fact, I wouldn't be surprised at all—yes, I'll make you a bet that he'll be the next president of the synagogue.

Author's note: Any resemblance between Mr. Irving Goldstein and somone living wouldn't be very surprising, would it?

Book Notes

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY— "TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS"

By Nathan A. Barack

MOST readers have probably read the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. Yet, because of the vital significance of its subject, we deem it advisable to summarize it at length. (We have, however, omitted all references to discrimination in the armed services, and in America's territorial possessions.)

The American Heritage of Civil Rights

Americans can be justly proud of their achievements in realizing the blessings of their great heritage of freedom and equality. Yet we must reexamine our record (for the third urgent time in our history) in order to discover and correct our failings. "We have a moral reason, an economic reason, an international reason for believing that the time for action is now."*

When we deny another his due rights, we come to accept the wrong as right, and we suffer morally.

Discrimination depresses the income of the underprivileged. It reduces their purchasing power, and ultimately affects all groups within the national economy. Furthermore, a nation living in a state of tension cannot use its energies constructively. "Individuals who are treated as second-class citizens will act as second-class citizens, and will feel no moral obligation to those who deny them equal rights."

"We have to know that our own security, in a highly interdependent world is inextricably tied to the security and well-being of all people and countries." The minorities discriminated against in our country, even when few in numbers, are identified with millions in other parts of the world. Those millions find the gap between our professed democratic ideals and our practice inacceptable. Nations with competing philosophies stress our failure. "The United States is not so strong, the final triumph of the democratic ideal is not so inevitable that we can ignore what the world thinks of us or our record."

To realize fully the American heritage, we must understand it clearly. "The central theme in our American heritage is the importance of the individual persons," whose dignity and well-being must be respected. To be secure in his own rights, every person must respect those of his fellows. The goal of the group should be to protect the rights of its individual members. There is no necessary conflict between group authority and personal freedom. "But (since) a democratic majority, left unrestrained, may be as ruthless and tyrannical as were the earlier absolute monarchs," there is a need for a Bill of Rights to safeguard the rights of unpopular minorities.

The American heritage of freedom and equality comprises four essential rights:

1. *The right to safety and security of person.*

Under this right no person is to be deprived of his freedom except for the legally established commission of an offense, clearly defined by law.

2. *The right to citizenship.*

Denial of citizenship or complete freedom to participate in the democratic process of government implies an inferior

* All quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are from the Report.

status. It means also that the individual is not free to act on matters affecting his own welfare.

3. *The right to freedom of conscience and expression.*

A free society is based on our faith in the people to make sound judgments. "Such judgments are possible only where the people have access to all relevant facts and to all prevailing interpretations of facts."

4. *Right to equality of opportunity.*

"The opportunity of each individual to obtain useful employment, and to have access to services in the fields of education, housing, health, recreation and transportation whether available free or at a price, must be provided with complete disregard for race, color, creed, and national origin."

These are the basic rights transmitted to us by our fathers. Have all of us been allowed to enjoy them?

Insufficient Security of the Person

"The record is neither as black as our detractors paint it, nor as white as people of good will would like it to be." Gains have been made even by Negroes in Southern states. From 64 lynchings in 1921, since 1940 the number has not gone above six. "The striking improvement in the record is a thing to be devoutly thankful for; (yet) a single lynching is one too many." In seven years recorded during the decade 1937-1946, 226 persons were rescued from threatened lynchings. When lynchings go unpunished, Negroes generally become intimidated. "The knowledge that a misinterpreted word or action can lead to his death is a dreadful burden."

Lynching is not the only breach of the right to safety and security of person. Instances of police brutality, unwarranted arrests and prolonged detention are not uncommon in both the South and North. "Unpopular, weak, or defenseless groups are most apt to suffer."

The weak and friendless sometimes suffer also in courts of justice. Trials may be unfair and perfunctory. Fines and prison sentences may be unreasonable.

The evacuation of the Japanese from the West Coast was the most striking interference with physical freedom since slavery. Of the 110,000 evacuated, two-thirds were United States citizens, and even they received no hearing of any kind. While the evacuation seemed necessary to the authorities, that action had a disturbing implication for the fundamental American belief that guilt is personal.

In a democracy, citizenship is very important, and yet by outright denial of citizenship or by denial of the vote, colored Americans are deprived of the right to participate in democratic government.

The Problem of Freedom of Expression

One of the most difficult problems confronting the American people today is that of maintaining freedom of expression, and defense against enemies of democracy, simultaneously. No special limitations of freedom of expression should be imposed, unless according to a famous ruling by Justice Holmes, "the words are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent."

Those who seek to influence public opinion should be required to disclose source and sponsorship of their propaganda. Anonymous material (one-third of total) of the election propaganda in the 1940 campaign was "most virulent, dishonest, and defamatory."

The government must especially be careful to safeguard the rights of its two

million employees, for if the government should fail to protect its employees, private employers will surely follow the lead.

Equality of Opportunity Not Achieved

The right to equality of opportunity is far from being fully enjoyed by racial and minority groups. Thus, a commercial agency of Chicago found in a survey that 50 percent of the openings for sales executives and 41 percent for male clerks were closed to Jews. "Many northern business concerns have an unwritten rule against appointing Jews to executive positions; railroad management and unions discourage the employment of Negroes as engineers or conductors." Minorities have made gains during the war, but they are being lost in the post-war period, where steps have not been taken to preserve them, as they have been in New York.

Jews and Negroes are often denied the right to equality of educational opportunities; Jews have mainly been discriminated against in admission to professional schools; Negroes have suffered particularly from the practice of segregation. The so-called "separate but equal" school facilities are seldom equal.

Discrimination is inexcusable even in private schools. "Such (private) schools immediately acquire a public character and importance. Invariably they enjoy government support, if only in the form of exemption from taxation. . . . Invariably, they render public service by training our young men for life in a democratic society. Consequently, they are possessed of a public responsibility from which there is no escape."

Discrimination in housing arises mainly because of business reasons. "It is 'good business' to develop exclusive 'restricted' suburban developments which are barred to all but White Gentiles." Banks, builders, and the community, prejudiced by non-cooperation or outright interference, prevent better housing for Negroes. By means of "restrictive covenants" property owners agree not to sell to "undesirables." Lower U. S. Courts have held these covenants to be legal, and have thus *enforced* discrimination.

Even medical services have not been equal for all minorities. Many hospitals do not admit Negro patients or doctors. Hotels and restaurants often deny service to minority members, officially, or unofficially. About all segregation (including that on trains) the Report says: "No argument or rationalization can alter this basic fact; a law which forbids a group of American citizens to associate with other citizens in the ordinary course of daily living creates inequality by imposing a caste status on the minority group."

"The District of Columbia should symbolize to our own citizens and to the people of all countries our great tradition of civil liberty. Instead, it is a graphic illustration of a failure of democracy." "The Negro who decides to settle in the District of Columbia must often find a home in an overcrowded substandard area. He must often take a job below the level of his ability. He must send his children to the inferior public schools set aside for Negroes and entrust his family's health to medical agencies which give inferior service. In addition, he must endure the countless daily humiliations that the system of segregation imposes upon the one-third of Washington that is Negro." The shamefulness and absurdity of Washington's treatment of Negro Americans is highlighted (by the treatment accorded) . . . foreign officials (who) are often mistaken for American Negroes and refused food, lodging and

entertainment (until) it is established that they are not Americans.

Recommended Legislation

These are our failings in the field of civil rights. It is the duty of the Federal Government as well as of local and state agencies, to correct the shortcomings by means of legislation and education.

The necessary legislation can be achieved within constitutional limits. If the United States should adopt the International Bill of Rights now being worked on by the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, then under a Supreme Court ruling in 1920 (Missouri vs. Holland) that Congress may enact statutes to carry out treaty obligations, even where in absence of treaty it has no power, there would be a stronger basis for Congressional action on civil rights legislation. (An interesting but utopian suggestion, for, unfortunately, Congress is not looking for such power.)

A permanent, adequate, informed, and interested Civil Rights Division within the Justice Department is necessary as are similar state agencies. "It may easily be a direct result of the Civil Rights Section's subordinate position that the total picture of work derived from the staff survey is that of a sincere, hard-working, but perhaps overcautious agency. Its relative lack of prestige in the Department of Justice, the legal and constitutional difficulties which confront it, the problems caused by its administrative relation to the F.B.I., the hostility of some U. S. Attorneys, the force of local prejudice, and the size of its staff, all combine to make the section less effective and less self-assured than the challenge of its assignment demands."

(The Committee then outlines a program of action which follows logically from the diagnosis of our shortcomings.)

We must always remember that "Civil rights in this country will never be adequately protected until the intelligent will of the American people approves and demands that protection. We must make constructive efforts to create an appropriate national outlook—a climate of public opinion which will outlaw individual abridgements of personal freedom, a climate of opinion as free from prejudice as we can make it."

Prejudice may result from experience, from propaganda, from "foolish generalizations about groups, from personal frustrations, from economic or social competition, or from local environments that are built on discrimination. It ranges from the mild, secret feeling of the social snob to the violent, murderous impulses of the insanely prejudiced. It seems probable that no one can become a bigoted fanatic unless he has need for prejudice towards others to begin with. . . . The achievement of full civil rights in law may do as much to end prejudice as the end of prejudice may do to achieve full civil rights. . . ." To rally people in behalf of civil rights, a long campaign of public education to acquaint people with their rights and duties must be conducted.

"There are social and psychological conditions which foster civil rights; there are others which imperil them. In a world forever tottering on the brink of war, civil rights will be precarious at best. In a nation wracked by depression and widespread economic insecurity, the inclination to consider civil rights a luxury will be more easily accepted. We need peace and prosperity for their own sake; we need them to secure our civil rights as well."

Comments on the Report

The Report is, of course, excellent as far as it goes. However, as the authors state, civil rights are inseparable from national and international social condi-

tions. The rights not only of minorities but also of majorities may suffer in time of economic crisis. The tremendous power gained by the corporations during and after the war has definitely created a condition that hampers the economic rights of the small man. An employee in dire need of a job cannot hope to avail himself of his freedom of speech in a fight with the industrial giants, especially when they engage in monopoly. Fear of lynching is not the only consideration that keeps one from speaking his mind. Fear of loss of job is more common, and is a potent force in curbing freedom of expression. (This is why Brandeis hated bigness in business.) Moreover, the fact that the press and radio have become big business has also impeded freedom of expression. Big business can afford to present its case; and it can pressure its opponents out of public channels of information. Thus General Electric (whose head, Chas. E. Wilson, to his great credit, was chairman of the Committee) has given the universal impression that it was earning a 7 percent profit on its investment, whereas in reality, according to an article in the January *Progressive* (cited also by Thomas L. Stokes) G.E. has been making 22 percent on capital investment. Because labor is comparatively poor, it lacked the means for public education, and thus could not prevent the passage by Congress of the Taft-Hartley bill and similar bills by the states.

The Committee expresses a general gratification about the fact that there was no unreasonable restriction of freedom of expression during the war, as many feared there would be. Yet, we now know that the desire of some leaders to regiment scientists may, if successful, turn out to be a greater disaster than any restriction of freedom of speech. (According to a recent *Nation* article, scientists were either not hired or were fired by private and public institutions because of membership in some liberal organization.)

The Report states that with the exception of certain instances (Jehovah's Witnesses) freedom of religion is definitely established in the United States. But here again one wonders what will be the ultimate outcome of the attempt to gain subsidies for parochial schools. The spiritual insecurity of our society and the fact that our secular schools do not educate for a spiritually maladjusted world may, eventually, seriously menace even that right long considered established firmly.

No doubt, members of the Committee were fully aware of these facts. We should be grateful that the Committee went as far as it did. It is our duty to see that its recommendations are effectuated. The President has recommended a minimum program of action which has aroused the ire of Southern reactionaries. It is our duty to urge its passage. Maybe the time has arrived for a realignment of parties on liberal and conservative platforms. Even if no immediate action results, the Report can become a grand opportunity for educating the public in civil rights. That opportunity must be utilized by all who mold public opinion. There can be no moral and effective United Nations without moral nations.

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE JEW IN AMERICAN SPORTS, by Harold D. Ribalow. Contains twenty-five close-ups of Jewish athletes in the field of all American sports, with a preface by Barney Ross. Illustrated by photographs of the athletes. xi + 288 pp. Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1948. $3.00.

DOWN HOLIDAY LANE, by Rose W. Golub. Contains nineteen stories for young children, all dealing with Jewish holidays. Illustrations by Louis Kabrin. 166 pp. Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Cincinnati, 1947. $1.50.

Random Thoughts

To keep the freedom we Jews have, we should demand as much as our inalienable rights entitle us to.

That calls for *self-emancipation.*

* * *

Pharaoh, in changing his mind after letting the Israelites go, set a precedent for great governments to grant the Jews freedom and then retract it.

By this time we ought to be used to this cat-and-mouse game the *goyim* have been playing with us.

* * *

The ages of mankind are often described as gold, silver, bronze and iron.

The deterioration of mankind and the principal ingredient of contemporary civilization are such that we may well be said to be living in the *oil age.*

God forbid that it be followed by the *ash age;* the phoenix is a rare bird.

* * *

Democratic freedom is the freedom of the public park and not of one's own back yard.

* * *

Communism, posing as a democracy, reminds us of the demon Ashmedai who, for a time, not only usurped King Solomon's throne, but actually tried to pass off as King Solomon himself.

* * *

In the race between catastrophe and education, education is fated to play the role of the tortoise, although catastrophe is far from acting like the hare in the fable.

Catastrophe is anything but dilatory, and leaves nothing to chance to gain its ends.

* * *

In a crisis when survival depends upon action which is free from all moral taint, it is better to be a venturesome fool than a timid angel.

* * *

The ambition of a Jewish child to acquire a Jewish education is bounded by the expectation of his parents, which is clear only on one point: they don't want him to be a rabbi.

* * *

The division of labor, according to which some do the dividing and the rest do the labor, does not work out.

* * *

The automatic mechanisms which have taken the backache out of physical work have put the headache into mental work.

* * *

The one thing biologists fail to understand is that, in becoming human, man has transferred his venue from that of the animal.

* * *

More important than knowing the statistics about the sex behavior of the human male on the animal level would it be to know how to manage those ideas which raise the level of his sex behavior above that of the animal.

But that kind of information is not likely to make a "best seller."

* * *

The tree of good and evil was a tree of knowledge, but not of wisdom.

Knowledge is power, and power may be put to good and evil uses.

But wisdom is the right use of power, and, therefore, can be only good.

* * *

The most we should expect from tradition is what a man is said to expect from a woman: inspiration.

M. M. K.

Correspondence

Buber's Moses Again

Sirs:

I agree with Buber that an unbiased reconstruction of the origin of the religion of Israel is of the utmost importance for present day Judaism. I have worked out a new scientific solution in a book entitled, "The First Hebrew Genius," for the publication of which I am seeking subscribers. In it I prove, with ample evidence, that tradition has overvalued Moses, and that modern criticism has overvalued the literary prophets. The key figure who humanized and spiritualized our religion was the narrator of our two oldest history books, now embedded in the Pentateuch and Samuel. I have identified this ethical and literary genius as the prophet Nathan, David's moral and political advisor and the educator of Solomon. His book was censored by the priests of his time. Later it was commented on by the two anti-pagan leaders, Elisha in the north (E) and Jehoyada in the south (P). Both versions were united under Hezekiah.

From this point of view, I will review Buber's answers.

1. *Moses' personality*: We have two figures, one a draconic dictator and another a humane leader who offers to sacrifice himself for his people and promulgates the God of Mercy and Forgiveness (*Ex.* 32-34). The second, I think, was the creation of the humanitarian Nathan.

2. *Origin of the Sabbath.* The Sabbath law underwent the following stages:

a. Before Samuel, the Sabbath was a day of abstention from work (because a day of bad omen) and of sacrifices, still depending on the moon, similar to what it was in the Babylonian-Canaanite tradition.

b. Samuel, the reorganizer of cult and law, fixed the week, independent of the moon (*Ex.* 23:12a).

c. Nathan made the Sabbath a day of social rest for ox, ass, slave and stranger 12b). This was the original Sabbath law in the Ten Commandments, which were first formulated by the historian Nathan as summary of the Mosaic laws.

d. The priests of Solomon missed the religious character and any reference to rest for the free Israelites. Therefore they added: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and "thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter."

e. Elisha, the miracle-minded nationalist, connected the Sabbath with the Exodus (*Deut.* 5:15).

f. Jehoyada, the priestly writer of *Gen.* 1, added the idea of God's having rested after the Creation (*Ex.* 20:11).

3. *Equal redistribution of land*: The authoritarian Samuel fixed the seventh year as year of rest (*Ex.* 23.11). The humane Nathan added, "for the poor and the beast" (11b). The idea of the jubilee year (*Lev.* 25) was the social program of the Josiah period, first tried out under Zedekiah (*Jer.* 34:8 ff).

4. *Prohibition of images*: The temples of Jerusalem and the north had images (bull, serpent) before Hezekiah. Under him the prohibition of images came into both versions of the Decalogue.

IMMANUEL LEWY

Correspondence on Israel J. Gerber's Articles

Sirs:

Your recent articles, "Pastoral Clinical Training in Operation" are very interesting and helpful.

A few years ago I paid a visit to Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan and suggested an idea on just what Rabbi Gerber has experienced in helping humanity in a personal way. . . . You can readily understand why I am pleased.

I feel a "marked copy," should be sent to all rabbis, especially those who preach in the pulpit. I believe it will make them realize that a Center, Temple or Synagogue should have a staff of rabbis who should visit their zone community as a symbol of God in service through man.

HENRIETTA LICHT
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Sirs:

Referring to Rabbi Israel J. Gerber's articles on pastoral training, published in *The Reconstructionist* of March 5, 1948 (Vol. XIV, No 2), and of March 19, 1948 (Vol. XIV, No. 3), I would appreciate clarification of the following. Does Rabbi Gerber want his colleagues to enroll for clinical pastoral training for a six-week course at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston? Doesn't he realize how ridiculous it is for them to do so? Shouldn't there be a preliminary requirement of psychiatric training? Would he commend a pharmacist to prescribe medicine? A great deal of study is needed before one is able to apply psychology and then a long period of internship is required. And yet, here in six weeks, the job is done! How dangerous that could be!

Rabbi Gerber is to be commended for lending his voice to the cry for more adequate training for spiritual leaders in mental hygiene.

GEORGE GARBER
Bronx, N. Y.

Rabbi Gerber's Reply to Mr. Garber

Sirs:

I wish to thank Mr. Garber for raising two specific points regarding my two articles. The questions he poses deal with the focus of clinical pastoral training and with the inadequacy of a brief (i.e., six weeks') course.

It should be made distinctly clear that the rabbi is not a psychologist nor a psychiatrist and should not be. Neither should he be apprenticed to either of these professions, since they are not his own. The goal of clinical pastoral training is to improve one's *pastoral* effectiveness, combining psychiatric insights with the unique resources of religion.

I felt I conveyed this impression in my articles by referring to the clergyman at the Institute of Pastoral Care as a *Chaplain-in-Training,* not as psychologist or psychiatrist-in-training. I futher quoted Prof. Paul E. Johnson to the extent that the trainee "participates in the work of the chaplain." If I did not make myself clear, then allow me to do so now.

My main reason in writing up my experiences with this type of training is stated at the outset, to "stir other rabbis to undergo similar post-graduate training" to better equip themselves to serve their parishioners. It need not be acquired at the Massachusetts General Hospital or at any other particular place, but to get it wherever they can. I personally feel that the Jewish theological seminaries should offer their own course of study. Since, however, they do not, then the services of the Institute of Pastoral Care should be used either in Boston or at Ann Arbor, Michigan.

I agree with Mr. Garber when he says that six weeks are not enough. I would go further and say that neither can six months accomplish the training many of us would like to have. Some, therefore, like myself, who are more favorably situated and have the inclination, have participated in special graduate work at mental hospitals and have taken many other courses to better equip themselves. In fact, a few of us shall receive our doctorates in the near future.

We must, however, face facts. Few established clergymen can get away from their positions for more than six weeks at the most. It is in realistic recognition of this fact that the Institute of Pastoral Care has offered this basic course in ministering to individuals. Throughout the six weeks there is ample admonition that this instruction is only an aid and not complete graduate training. This has led me to suggest that this training should be acquired before leaving the seminary. Furthermore, I say in my articles that I did not get all the answers at the Institute and the Institute claims no such success. However, no one of us who attended will deny its helpfulness.

May I add that the Pastoral Counseling Center I was to open in Fitchburg has been in operation for a number of months, and we have met with wide acceptance by the clergy, the social agencies, the police department, the doctors, and the community as a whole. We have had referrals from them and have made referrals to them. ISRAEL J. GERBER

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 8)

willingness to "consider a production on a Hanukkah or Shavuot theme if it could be of high caliber and of a universal level."

According to Rabbi Gordon, plans are also under way to have some of the New York Department stores "set up attractive displays In their huge windows depicting the spirit of Passover or Hanukkah or Shavuot, just as they have had displays on Christmas and Easter."

▼

THE REV. HARRY S. MESERVE, minister of the First Unitarian Church in Buffalo, N. Y., proposes an interesting alternative to the released time plan. Released time gives public school children an opportunity to receive religious instruction during school hours under denominational auspices approved by their parents. His proposal is that they be given instead a course prepared by an interfaith group of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish laymen designed to stress "the basic underlying unities among the various groups."

This sounds to us like good sense. No religious community finds that the released time program affords an adequate education in its historic religious traditions and doctrines. Moreover, the use of the public school system to encourage any religious denominational teaching is questionable. It has been opposed as a source of division and conflict in the community. But the Rev. Mr. Meserve's proposal would make for unity not division and could be justified as necessary training in American democracy.